UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes Francis Neilson

One That Troubleth Israel

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Giolitti's Bill to Abolish Secret Diplomacy

By E. D. MOREL

Straws Show How the Wind Blows

By JAMES WALDO FAWCETT

VOLUME LXXXVI NUMBER 21

Chicago, February 10, 1921

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

ESTABLISHED 1878

$3.00 PER ANNUM.

With THE FREE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, THE CONGRESS OF RELIGIONS, and all other organizations and individuals seeking to widen fellowship and to realize the Brotherhood of the Spirit unrimmed by creed, form or sectarian prejudices

EDITORS
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
FRANCIS NEILSON

ASSISTANT EDITOR
EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE
Pamphlet Mission
FOR
FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER
IN
RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:
Robert Collyer, Chicago. Wm. C. Gannett, St. Paul.
Jenkin Ll. Jones, Janesville. C. W. Wendte, Cincinnati.
J. C. Learned, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

Frances L. Roberts, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. Sunderland, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
Geo. W. Cooke, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS
Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
Frank C. Doan
Charles F. Dole
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
George Grover Mills
Susan M. Quackenbush
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
Albert R. Vail
Arthur L. Weatherly
James H. West

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, CHICAGO, ILL.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

Sample Copies of UNITY Sent Upon Request

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Contents:

EDITORIAL—
Notes.—J. H. H. 323
One That Troubleth Israel.—John Haynes Holmes. . . . 325

CONTRIBUTED—
H. G. Wells on Great Men.—John Haynes Holmes. 327
Straws Show How the Wind Blows.—J. W. F. 328
The Education of Men.—Arthur L. Weatherly. 330
Cleanings.—Kay V. Kleaner. 330

SELECTED—
Giolitti's Bill to Abolish Secret Diplomacy.—*E. D. Morel* 331

A BOOK A WEEK—
The Book of the Long Trail.—James Waldo Fawcett. . 334

POETRY—
His Face.—*Florence Earle Coates*. 323
The Dreamer.—Thomas Curtis Clark. 327
Sea-Gull Song.—*Mary Carolyn Davies*. 333
Like Thee.—*León Felipe*. 335

THE FIELD—
Tag Day in Chinese Cities for Famine Victims. 335
Church Unity in India. 335
The World's "Cold Shoulder" to Japan. 335

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOL. LXXXVI THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1921 NUMBER 21

HIS FACE.

They tell you Lincoln was ungainly, plain?
To some he seemed so: true.
Yet in his look was charm to gain
E'en such as I, who knew
With how confirmed a will he tried
To overthrow a cause for which I would have died.

The sun may shine with naught to shroud
Its beam, yet show less bright
Than when from out eclipsing cloud
It pours its radiant light;
And Lincoln, seen amid the shows of war
Clothed in his sober black, was somehow felt the more

To be a center and a soul of power—
An influence benign
To kindle in a faithless hour
New trust in the divine.
Grave was his visage, but no cloud could dull
The radiance from within that made it beautiful.

A prisoner, when I saw him first—
Wounded and sick for home—
His presence soothed my yearning's thirst
While yet his lips were dumb;
For such compassion as his countenance wore
I had not seen nor felt in human face before.

And when, low-bending o'er his foe,
He took in his firm hand
My wasted one, I seemed to know
We two were of one Land;
And as my cheek flushed warm with young surprise,
God's pity looked on me from Lincoln's sorrowing eyes.

His prisoner I was from then—
Love makes surrender sure—
And though I saw him not again,
Some memories endure,
And I am glad my untaught worship knew
His the divinest face I ever looked into!

—*Florence Earle Coates.*

It is a ghastly experience for an unsophisticated easterner, who believes naively in the spiritual ideal of the brotherhood of man, to drop down suddenly over the Sierras into California, and find the feeling which there prevails on the Japanese question. It is an exact duplication of the racial situation in the South, with the yellow man taking the place of the black man. California is evidently determined to shut out the Japanese altogether from the political and social life of America, and does not hesitate to hazard a war with the empire of the Mikado in order to sustain its point. In a casual editorial in a San Francisco newspaper occur such statements as these: "Our domestic laws are no legitimate concern of Japan"; "the California law should not be even discussed with Japan"; "if for reasons of our own we choose to permit some aliens to our land and forbid others to do so, it is none of Japan's business." Such an arrogant spirit as this is manifestly impossible. It will solve no problems—only make a bad matter infinitely worse! We hope that our California fellow-citizens realize that they are playing with fire; and that the rest of the country will not lightly regard the deliberate provocation of hostilities on an issue which outrages every American and Christian principle of human brotherhood.

We know of nothing more melancholy than to journey across the continent, and study the newspapers which the great American public are given to read. At each city we pick up the local sheet, and straightway find ourselves immersed in a filthy flood of local murders, divorces, assaults, and social scandals, held in bound by nothing but the towering barriers of "ads," which show conclusively that the journal is primarily an advertising medium, and not a news sheet at all. Of world currents there are nothing in these papers, save a few two-inch press dispatches from New York or London or Paris; and of course the familiar "Mutt and Jeff" and "Bringing Up Father" cartoons. Editorial columns are reduced to a minimum of intelligence and space, on the supposition, no doubt, that the public has long since given up the habit of thinking. To contemplate the spectacle of the American people subsisting on this sort of daily reading matter hardly conduces to optimism, although it helps to an understanding of what happened in the last election. But to consider the profession which produces such newspapers is to face utter and blank despair. What has become of the dignity and self-respect of our journalists, that they are willing to be a part of such handiwork as this? Have we got any journalists at all any more? Certainly the papers which we have to buy and read, would seem to indicate that we have nothing but a tribe of advertising agents and scandalmongers.

Discussion of our newspapers brings to mind the fact that there is no greater lie current in our time than the hoary legend, offered in defense of every journalistic and theatrical indecency, that "the public gets what it wants." In our recent trip across the continent we took particular pains to test people's attitude toward their newspapers. Without exception, among persons of every walk of life and every shade of opinion, we found nothing but contempt and hostility, joined with a feeling of utter helplessness as to what to do about the situation. To mention the newspapers to any audience of any kind, in the respectable

woman's club as in the labor forum, was to arouse at once a mingling of amusement and anger. If anything is plain today, it is that the American people are reading their newspapers not because they want to, or because they "get what they want," but because there is nothing else in the journalistic field to read! What we have in this country every morning is the spectacle of a hundred million people picking up their newspapers and surveying them in a mood of sullen disdain and baffled protest. That this bodes anything good for the future of America is difficult to believe, even in our most Mark Tapleyan mood.

It is amazing to see the extravagances to which sober and intelligent men are tempted when the world goes contrary to their opinions. Here, for example, is Judge John C. Pollock, of the United States District Court in Kansas, described as a man of preëminently "the judicial temperament," declaring that the eighteenth amendment must be repealed, if the nation is to be saved from revolution. "Repeal, or revolution ultimately is inevitable" is his prophecy. Indeed, in the crime wave now sweeping the country, Judge Pollock sees the beginnings of such social upheavals as overturned France in 1789 and Russia in 1917. This crime wave, of course, "is due to the elimination of the saloon." Therefore, if we want to save America from Bolshevism and kindred terrors, we must do away with prohibition and restore to an outraged public its can of beer! All this is amazingly simple; but we regard it as inanely silly as any of the verbal stuff poured forth by the soap-box fanatics of the street corner. Nay, these fanatics are wise and learned men compared to this federal Judge. For anybody who can look at America today and see nothing wrong but prohibition is surely reduced to the last stages of imbecility. To think of revolution coming to this country in the space of the present generation itself requires a vast deal of imagination. But if it does come, it will be for reasons infinitely more fundamental than closed saloons!

"This is *official*"—"the government announced *officially* to-day"—"an *official* statement from the Department of State"—such are the phrases which accompany many important news items these days from Washington, Paris, London and other capitals. They seem to imply the conviction on the part of newspaper readers that, if a statement is labeled "official," it must therefore be true. And most people undoubtedly so regard it! As a matter of fact, however, if the experience of the last five or six years is any test, the word "official" attached to a dispatch is *bona fide* evidence that it is a *lie*. If a government takes the trouble to issue an "official" statement on any question, it is certain that, for some reason, it desires to deceive the people, and is using deliberate falsehood to accomplish its end. "Official" means that a premier, or a war minister, or a secretary of state, is telling a lie, and that he is on this occasion unwilling to lie personally. In the welter of information and misinformation which is poured upon us daily by the newspaper press it is hard to know what to believe and not believe. Nearly all rules fail. One rule there is, however, which holds—namely, the *"official"* statement is a *false* statement. "Material furnished by a government," says Henry Adams, in his famous book, "lies always under suspicion."

Dr. Inge, "the gloomy dean" of St. Paul's, London, has been speaking out frankly and bravely on the duty of forgiving our enemies. At a recent Church Congress, held in Southend, England, a town which was bombed more often by German air raiders perhaps than any other place in the British Isles, this distinguished churchman said, "I love my country as much as any of you, but, as Edith Cavell said before her death, 'patriotism is not enough.' In Christ Jesus there is neither Jew nor Greek, German nor Englishman. We are all one in Christ Jesus." The Bishop of Litchfield endorsed the Dean's remarks, and among other things denounced the rank hypocrisy of permitting business houses to enter into relations with Germany for purposes of profit, and at the same time refusing admittance of Germany into the League of Nations for purposes of peace. These addresses found no unanimous approval from their hearers, be it said; but the speakers were not mobbed, and at last reports have not been placed behind prison doors. Perhaps the time is near at hand, after all, when it may be safe to read the Sermon on the Mount, and even to use its golden texts as themes for sermons. At least, there may be chance of doing this without disastrous consequences, until the next war comes.

It is not altogether impossible to diagnose the reasons for the election of Dr. William T. Manning, of the great Trinity Parish, to the bishopric of New York. Dr. Manning is unquestionably an able executive. He has long been absorbed in ecclesiastical interests of one kind and another. Furthermore, he is an active and ardent exponent of that movement for church unity which has so long held the imagination of Episcopalians. Even so, however, Dr. Manning's elevation to the highest office in the gift of his denomination still remains an amazing phenomenon. It would be difficult to conceive a man who embodies a more complete personal antithesis to such illustrious men as

Bishops Potter and Greer than this prelate who now succeeds them in the New York diocese. Dr. Manning is a typical churchman of the most rigorous medieval type. His ideas are of the ancient and not at all of the modern day. His spirit is narrow, intolerant and bigoted. He is identified exclusively with the aristocratic section of society, and thus altogether removed from every democratic impulse of our time. It is impossible to think of him as swept by any passion for humanity, or touched with understanding sympathy either for the weak or for their champions. Under his sway the Episcopal church of New York can be counted upon to be the uncompromising foe of every liberalizing and progressive movement of the age. If the tendency from Potter to Manning is any sign, our organized Christianity is in a sorry plight indeed.

News from England that the "National Assembly of the Church of England is now a going concern" brings our attention to one of the most important developments in modern religious history. Ever since the time that England has had a parliament, the government of the Church has been in the hands of this legislative body. For centuries past, that is, all church legislation has been enacted by the House of Commons and the House of Lords, exactly as the regular legislation of the realm has been so enacted. About a year ago, however, there was passed a law by the terms of which parliament deliberately surrendered its control of the church and created the National Assembly above referred to to take its place. All control of ecclesiastical matters is now in the hands of this new body, which is organized to meet in five-day sessions three times a year, February, July and November. It is expressly provided that the assembly shall not deal with doctrinal matters, but limit itself to problems of church government, over which its control is absolute. It is interesting to note that the National Assembly includes a large representation of laymen who have not been slow in making their presence felt. Among the bills introduced and supported by lay members of the Assembly is one creating a parochial church Council in every parish in the Kingdom. This Council will be permitted to file with the bishop protests against unsatisfactory incumbents of the parish church and advise on the appointment of new incumbents. *The Continent* (December 30, 1920) states that "a more startling introduction of democracy into Episcopacy has not recently come into view."

One That Troubleth Israel

Those persons who are looking for straight thinking and plain speaking in religion, and the thrill which always attaches to such unusual events, may well keep their attention fixed these days on Dr. Percy Stickney Grant, rector of the Church of the Ascension in New York City. For a long series of months, now, he has struck one sledge-hammer blow after another against the bulwarks of theological and economic reaction which still do so much to sustain the crumbling structure of organized religion. One follows, with growing excitement, the unfolding of the purpose which he seems to have at heart; and one wonders how long an open break with the Episcopal hierarchy can be avoided.

Dr. Grant has long been conspicuous for progressive thought in the field of theology, independence of ecclesiastical custom and tradition, sympathy with the workers, and bold leadership in what is now so familiarly known as the socialization of religion. It was in December, 1919, however, that he was brought into most notable public attention by his sweeping attack on the Department of Justice for its lawless raiding and deportation of so-called communists, and his appeal for fair and sympathetic treatment of the radicals among us. It was a terrific storm of denunciation and abuse which swept down upon the head of this outspoken churchman in those days still so hectic with the raging fever of the War and its aftermath. As usual in such cases, however, it was the brave man, and especially the just and humane man, and not his detractors, who was right; and now, only a little over a year since he espoused the cause of the friendless deportees of the "Buford," Dr. Grant finds himself amply vindicated. Attorney-General Palmer, once the loudly-baying pursuer of all those too weak to challenge or to daunt his cowardice, is now the whimpering pursued. Honored members of his own profession have arisen to expose his practises as in contravention alike of statute law and Constitution, involving as they do, to quote the words of former Justice Hughes, "violations of personal rights which savor of the worst practises of tyranny." Incorruptible judges, notably Judge Anderson, of Boston, have halted his outrageous proceedings by court action, and freed many of the helpless victims of his lawless cruelty. Even the Department of Labor, in the person of Assistant Secretary Louis A. Post, has found it necessary to countermand the orders of Mr. Palmer; and Congress to start an investigation of his conduct in office. The *New Republic* sums up the present situation when it says (January 19, 1921), "It would seem that nothing but his early departure from office could save the Attorney-General of the United States from impeachment." All this Dr. Grant foresaw, and spoke when it was dangerous to speak.

The Rector of the Church of the Ascension was again brought into public prominence, some months later, when he attempted to save his Sunday evening forum from the attacks of his enemies inside the church. In this he only partially succeeded, at least for the time being, for the forum was put under diocesan supervision, and its characteristic feature of free discussion very definitely restricted. It is not to be believed, however, at least by those who know Dr. Grant, that he is going to let the matter lie here. The struggle last spring was but a skirmish, with the decisive battles for democracy within the church still to come.

Another notable occasion in the recent career of Dr. Grant was the preaching of his sermon, last fall, on the subject of the consecration of church buildings. It was this bugaboo of "consecration" which had brought the Ascension Forum under attack, and so greatly limited its freedom. A church, it was argued, duly consecrated by a bishop, must be used strictly and exclusively for religious purposes. Now a forum in which all sorts and conditions of men gather for the unfettered discussion of political and economic questions is not a religious meeting. To hold such, therefore, in a church auditorium, and before a church altar, is a profanation, and must not be allowed! It is this absurdity which Dr. Grant smote, like Samson the Philistines, in the sermon just referred to. An act of consecration, thus interpreted, he declared, is plain, matter-of-fact superstition. What is there, in these ritualistic words spoken by a bishop, which makes this church building different from any other building? By what magic is it endowed with sanctity; and what *is* this sanctity which thus miraculously appears? The thing which consecrates any other object is the human uses to which it is put, the human causes of uplift and emancipation which it is made to serve. A saint is certainly none other than one who truly loves and serves his fellow-men. And so with churches! They are here to be used for men, and when so used are consecrated, and therefore holy. Religion is no narrow experience of creeds and formulas; it is no mere business of altars and prayer-books and Sunday services of worship. Religion is life, seeking expression in ways of truth, goodness and beauty; and all that helps in such expression of vital spiritual processes must be regarded as religious. The forum, therefore, Dr. Grant vindicated as a religious meeting, and itself a consecration of the church more potent than any mummery of bishop's words. Instead of excluding such a popular gathering as the forum from its precincts, said Dr. Grant, in striking phrase, the church should go forth to the street corners and gutters, where the people assemble to discuss their common affairs, and *roof over* these gatherings of the multitudes. Every such roof, so lifted, would be a church, whether a bishop blessed it or not, for where the people are, *there* is the living God.

A final ringing utterance from this New York churchman came on January 16th last, when he preached a remarkable sermon on "The Election of a Bishop." This sermon was throughout a plea for liberalism in all matters of theological belief and ecclesiastical practise. In one feature, at least, it was startling. We refer to the "bishop's platform" which he suggested to the candidates for the succession to the late Bishop Burch in New York, and which we reprint herewith in full:

A BISHOP'S PLATFORM

1. I will vote to put the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds in the back of the Prayer Book with the Athanansian Creed, and the thirty-nine Articles, and not require them as a part of the morning and evening prayer or communion service.

2. I advise a further revision of the Prayer Book that would not ask questions in the baptism service that are now asked—a belief in the Articles of the Christian Faith, as contained in the Apostles' Creed, which no mature and educated person today can assent to without stultifying reservations, and no clergyman can ask without mental mortification. In fact, I believe there should be a revision of the Prayer Book to take out of it the attitude of ignorance toward natural science and toward social and political organizations that are commonplaces today.

3. I will work to bring about a proportional representation in general convention.

4. I stand upon a social and economic platform for the Church, at least as broad and progressive as that announced in the recent English Lambeth Conference or the output of the Methodist Church and of the Catholic Church.

5. I promise to advise in my pastoral letter, and to attempt to organize the diocese and the parishes so that the weight of financial management shall not be placed upon the clergy, untrained in business methods, but upon business men. The Financial Committee in each parish and the Financial Committee of the diocese should take charge of their respective budget requirements and secure funds as they would for any other purpose they considered important, without asking the initiative or co-operation of the clergy.

6. I regret that if elected I shall have to live in a $300,000 house, and have to conduct services in a $15,000,000 Cathedral. The interest charges, to say nothing about up-keep, will amount to nearly $1,000,000 a year.

7. I will approve of no church legislation that contravenes or tends to undermine the law of the land, as, for instance, in the matter of marriage and divorce. And I will urge in all church usages (even in the sacraments) obedience to modern sanitary codes.

It is obvious enough, from such a record in recent months as this, that Percy Stickney Grant, like Elijah of old, is one who "troubleth Israel," at least in the eyes of those who sit in the seats of power. He is one who has little respect for convention, a free spirit and therefore no superstitious reverence for authority, an acceptance of religion in terms of uncompromising humanism, and a passionate love for and belief in the people. Such a man, when unafraid, is bound to make trouble for the defenders of things as they are. What makes the situation so interesting as regards Dr. Grant is his character as a churchman, and his place in a hierarchy second only to Rome and Lambeth for ecclesiastical self-consciousness and power. The questions which inevitably suggest themselves to every outside observer are, first, how long can Dr. Grant

stay in the Episcopal church? and secondly, how long will the Episcopal church allow him to stay, if he does not voluntarily withdraw? Unless we are very much mistaken, Dr. Grant is by temperament, intention and desire a "stay-iner" rather than a "come-outer." He believes in boring from within rather than attacking from without. He has great patience as well as courage and audacity, tact as well as capacity for dictation and control, a resolute determination which can bide its time as terribly as it can strike. So far as he is concerned, enjoying as he does supreme power in his own parish, he is apparently willing to fight the good fight, right where he now is, to the bitter end, and of course to the everlasting good of American Episcopacy. But will the church permit him to remain; or leave him freedom enough to maintain his self-respect? Perhaps the new bishop of the diocese of New York is proposing to answer these inquiries!

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

THE DREAMER.

He knew the curse of poverty,
But, lighted by his dream,
He heeded not the clouds of night
That covered him. The gleam
Of high ambition led him on
Through cruel years of fate
Until he entered, heaven-led,
The pathway of the great.

He found, amid the sloughs of youth,
A path of blessedness,
And, as he walked the stony road
Of eminent success,
He kept his lofty dream of truth,
Nor left her righteous way
Until the crown of martyrdom
Brought sunset to his day.

O tender ruler of our hearts,
Bequeath to us the grace
That shone from heaven's inmost shrine
Upon thy saintly face.
On selfishness and greed and pride
We rear our mighty State:
Inspire in us again the Dream
That made thy leading great.

THOMAS CURTIS CLARK.

The intelligence required for the solving of social problems is not a thing of the mere intellect. It must be animated with the religious sentiment and warm with sympathy for human suffering. It must stretch out beyond self-interest, whether it be self-interest of the few or of the many. It must seek justice. For at the bottom of every social problem we find a social wrong.

The greatest, the most fundamental of all reforms, the reform which will make all other reforms easier, and without which no other reform will avail, is to be reached by concentrating all taxation into a tax upon the value of land, and making that heavy enough to take as near as may be the whole ground-rent for common purposes. In this simple proposition is involved the greatest of social revolutions—a revolution compared with which that which destroyed ancient monarchy in France, or that which destroyed slavery in our Southern States, was as nothing.

—*Henry George.*

CONTRIBUTED

H. G. Wells on Great Men

Mr. Wells is infinitely interesting in his "The Outline of History," as he is in every other book that he has ever written. In nothing is he more interesting, than in his judgment on the great and familiar characters of history. His two capacious volumes are full of vivid, original and daring characterizations. We append a few herewith, that those of our readers who have not read the book, may taste something of the experience which is before them. J. H. H.

David—an adventurer (whose) story, with its constant assassinations and executions, reads rather like the history of some savage chief than of a civilized monarch.—I:287.

Pericles—a man of extraordinary vigor and liberality of mind. In him there was mingled in the strangest fashion political ability with a real living passion for deep and high and beautiful things.—I:345.

Philip of Macedon—one of the greatest monarchs the world has ever seen; he was a man of the utmost intelligence and ability, and his range of ideas was vastly beyond the scope of his time.—I:368.

Demosthenes—a demagogue—a man of reckless rhetoric.—I:368.

Alexander the Great—in many ways gifted beyond any man of his time, (but) vain, suspicious and passionate.—I:377.

Buddha—one of the most penetrating intelligences the world has ever known.—I:423.

Asoka—one of the great monarchs of history—the only military monarch on record who abandoned warfare after victory. Amidst the tens of thousands of names of monarchs that crowd the columns of history, the name of Asoka shines, and shines almost alone, a star.—I:431, 432.

Cato—his ruling passion seems to have been hatred for any human happiness but his own. . . . He posed as a champion of religion and public morality, and under this convenient cloak carried on a life-long war against everything that was young, gracious or pleasant.—I:473.

Scipio—a very fine gentleman indeed, a great scholar and a generous man.—I:476, 477.

Tiberius Gracchus—looks more like an honest man than any other figure in this period of time, unless it be Scipio.—I:499.

Julius Caesar—(has been) magnified and dressed up for the admiration of careless and uncritical readers. . . . An elderly sensualist or sentimentalist, rather than a master-ruler of men.—I:510.

Cicero—a man inspired by broad ideas; a noble and pathetically ineffective figure.—I:513.

Augustus Caesar—a man of greater breadth and capacity than any other man (of his time).—I:515.

Jesus—of manifest inimitable greatness . . . a being very human, very earnest and passionate, . . . teaching a new and simple and profound doctrine. . . . He was clearly a person of intense personal magnetism. . . . He was too great for his disciples. To take him seriously was to enter upon a strange and alarming life, to abandon habits, to control instincts and impulses, to essay an incredible happiness. Is it

any wonder that, to this day, the Galilean is too much for our small hearts?—I:575, 581, 594.

Paul—a man of much wider education and much narnower intellectuality than Jesus. . . . He found the Nazarenes with a spirit and a hope, and he left them Christians with the beginning of a creed.—I:587.

Mohammed—a man of great imaginative power . . . with most of the virtues and defects of the Bedouin. . . . Because he too founded a religion, there are those who write of this evidently lustful and rather shifty leader as though he were a man to put beside Jesus or Gautama. But it is manifest that he was a being of commoner clay; he was vain, egotistical, tyrannous, and a self-deceiver.—II:8, 13.

Charlemagne—as in the case of Alexander the Great and Julius Caesar, posterity has enormously exaggerated his memory.—II:51.

Yeliu Chutsai—one of the great political leaders of history.—II:110.

Akbar—one of the few great royal figures that approach the stature of great men.—II:133.

John Huss—a martyr for the free intelligence and free conscience of mankind.—II:151.

Roger Bacon—of more significance to mankind than any monarch of his time.—II:171.

Machiavelli—a man morally blind.—II:197.

Charles I—one of the meanest and most treacherous occupants the English throne ever knew.—II:222.

Louis XIV—an exceptionally able king . . . guided his country with an elaborate dignity that still extorts our admiration.—II:237.

Rousseau—an eloquent sentimentalist. His work was essentially demoralizing.—II:310.

Marie Antoinette—a silly and extravagant woman.—II:311.

Marat—a great man, a fine intelligence—stands out in history as a man of rare and unblemished honesty.—II:325.

Napoleon—an adventurer and wrecker. . . . A dark, archaic personage, hard, compact, capable, unscrupulous, imitative and neatly vulgar. The figure he makes in history is one of almost incredible vanity, greed and cunning. . . . A scoundrel, bright and complete. . . . In all history there is no figure so completely antithetical to the figure of Jesus.—II:348, 376.

Tallyrand—a greater statesman (than Napoleon).——II:374.

Gladstone—a person of exceptional intellectual vigor, . . . but his circumstances and temperament conspired against his ever attaining any real vision of the world. . . . A white-faced, black-haired man of incredible energy, with eyes like an eagle's, wrath almost divine, and "the finest baritone voice in Europe." He apprehended things romantically, and therefore in a manner suitable for passionate treatment in large halls.—II:429, 431.

When the white man governs himself, that is self-government; but when he governs himself and also governs another man, that is more than self-government—that is despotism.—*Abraham Lincoln.*

Straws Show How the Wind Blows

The Czar's Debt

It is said that the one point of disagreement still unsettled between Soviet Russia and the British Empire is that of the Czar's debt to English financiers. This is, as it seems to us, a very important difference; and we cannot see how Lenine can ask the Russian people to pay the debt any more than we can see how Lloyd George can ask his bankers to forego collection. Two fundamentally opposed ideas of justice are involved. The Czar's debt is not in any genuine sense a Russian debt. The money was used to maintain the Czar's secret police and to provide gaiety and graft for the Czar's courtiers, including Rasputin's group of degenerate wasters. The plain Russian peasant profited nothing by the spending of this ill-gotten money; why, then, should he repay it? On the other hand, the British bankers lent the money of the British people—they never lend their own money—and while they were grievously at fault in lending to the Czar they cannot be severely blamed for wishing to secure the loan's repayment. The Czar's property was, of course, a myth; he never produced anything (except misery and death), so he did not really own anything. Hence it is impossible to repay the debt from the already foreclosed imperial holdings. What belonged to the people and was held a while by an exploiter and thief has been found and returned to them. The Czar had no personal property to seize, no salary to attach. It seems impossible to arrange a settlement that will be just to all parties. The genius of the great Russian administrators will be severely tried in this matter, and the whole world may well be grateful to them if they find an equitable solution for the problem.

The Efficiency of Women

A leading British shipbuilder, in commenting on the efficiency of women in industry, says: "If the war had lasted another two years I would have undertaken to build a dreadnaught with female labor." It is well, then, that the war stopped when it did, for we do not like the idea of the constructive genius of woman going into the manufacture of warships. Women are efficient, they have always been so—thinking men have known this for generations. It did not require the World War to prove woman's value as a worker; it merely required a little brain exercise on the part of men. The truth is that women in general are *more* efficient than men, if in a more limited field, and their work endures because it is well done.

The Methodist Church and the Stage

The Methodist Episcopal Church has from time to time allowed its officers and ministers to speak bitterly and often unfairly of the actor's profession; and the people of the stage have long memories. Recently the Methodist churches of New York City asked the theatres to give a number of special Sunday performances in aid of the Chinese Famine Fund being raised by the denomination. One prominent actor immediately declined to give his services on the ground that "a church which excommunicates actors and warns its members against the theatre because it is 'a place of the devil' should not ask the services of those whose profession 'is discreditable.'" The occasion is a painful one, and suggests that the Church should revise its un-Christian attitude toward the stage and its people

and practice a little more of the charity of the generous, democratic Christ. The stage, as an institution, is far from perfect, but, unfortunately, the Church is in little, if any, better condition.

More Than a Judge

An eighteen-year-old boy was brought before Judge MacMahon in the Brooklyn County Court to plead guilty to attempted arson. The proceedings disclosed the fact that the lad, undersized and underdeveloped, had never had any ethical instruction, had never been to church. The judge remarked upon "the grave lack of religious training" of boys in general, and continued:

> If Christ came upon earth again He would not be allowed to occupy a pew in many of our churches. Amid the rustle of silks and satins His seamless tunic would be looked upon with disdain.

This severe indictment of our hypocritical attitude toward the Great Teacher is not new in any sense; many forward-looking ministers have said the same thing many times. But the magistrate is to be congratulated on the excellent use he made of his opportunity to be, as the occasion prompted, something more than a judge.

New York's New Governor

The State of New York now has a Governor who was until recently a judge; this gentleman suffers from the complex that we call the judicial mind. He has been in office only a few weeks and has already created a storm of difficulties for himself, his party and the plain citizens who pay the taxes. He has interfered in behalf of the greedy traction companies in the peculiar traffic and transportation problem of New York City and has asked the Legislature, which paradoxically is controlled by upstate farmers, for arbitrary power to increase the subway, elevated railway and street car fares—a move which strikes at the entire economic standard of the metropolis and suggests an almost criminal desire on the executive's part to serve the corporations. The working of his mind as shown in his speeches and messages is something absolutely fascinating to the eye of the amateur psychologist. For example, some thousands of men and women, including Mrs. Woodrow Wilson and many other prominent national figures, petitioned the new Governor to commute to life imprisonment, pending further investigation, the death sentence passed on two Mexicans for alleged murder; the case turns on disputed circumstantial evidence. The Governor replied:

> I do not propose to grant reprieves either to raise false hopes in the breasts of defendants or to magnify the chances of escape from the consequences of crime in the minds of those against whom society needs to be protected.
>
> Unnecessary delays in the execution of the judgments of the courts merely tend to bring the administration of justice into disrepute. Punishment for crime should be made as certain as possible and should follow the offense as speedily as the due and orderly administration of justice will admit.

This statement is typical. Its purpose is, plainly, an apology for and a defense of the judicial system and, as it follows, of the judicial attitude of mind. It shows no element of mercy, no intention to concede even the occasional fallibility of the Law. It is what we have learned to expect from professional jurists. They always make poor executives. They have not the heart that makes them wholly trustworthy. Thus, it will be seen, the violenec of the Law strikes back at its own creatures and hardens and dehumanizes them.

Mrs. Asquith and President Wilson

Mrs. Asquith's memoirs continue to stir British critics of all classes to bitter retort, and bid fair to replace the journals of the veteran Wilfrid Blunt for social satire and cynicism. She has added a new collection of sensations to the already turbulent situation by writing a magazine article on the Versailles conference. Of Lloyd George, she says: "He is one of the best platform speakers," but "unless eloquence conveys character, and is accompanied by action, it is as sounding brass and a tinkling of the cymbal." Of the conference, she says:

> Christening the four "Big" was fantastic. If any one of them had had any foresight, or even a little greatness, the stupid peace of 1919 would never have been perpetrated. The Paris peace was weakened, first by the unconscientious delay of an insensate general election brought about by the personal ambition of the Prime Minister—that is, Lloyd George. Second, by a prevalent though natural desire for revenge in France. Lastly, by the complete collapse of America, through its President on the one side, and its people on the other—and ultimately by a general policy of greed, grab and intrigue, which reduced Versailles to a thieves' kitchen. The worst qualities of every nation, instead of the best, were as violently visible as the flags flown from the ships.

She condemns our President as a statesman, but adds these striking sentences referring to his well-known oratorical ability and personal appearance:

> I enjoyed hearing President Wilson at the luncheon given to him in the city on December 28, 1918, more, almost, than anything I could have imagined. His is the kind of speaking I like best. Lord Hugh Cecil has white fire and is more brilliant and more elevating. But the President has a quality of his own which it is impossible to put on paper. His refined, egotistical face, thin, slightly sensual mouth and quiet but thrilling voice add to his unusualness.

The more one reads of this remarkable woman's experience and opinion the more one distrusts the complete accuracy of her judgment; but one cannot avoid some feeling of admiration for her daring and some appreciation of her ability to use a pen as a dagger. Summing up the President as she does is simply Shavian, *only more so.*

President Wilson's Wise Decision

It is announced that President Wilson will not write his memoirs and that he has decided that it would be unfair for him to attempt to influence historical judgment by a personal statement defending his attitude toward the problems of the World War and the subsequent peace conference. This is, of course, a very wise decision on the part of the President—almost the wisest thing he has done in the past four or five years. For it is obvious that any book he would now write regarding the history of his administration would but provide his enemies with ammunition for a new, almost *post mortem* attack. The major issues, as it happens, have already been decided; and nothing that the President can say will affect them at this late day. He had two great opportunities to achieve a deservedly important historical position. The first of these was provided by the events which marked the opening of the war, in the summer of 1914; and had the President possessed the genius for human service and the love of peace and freedom claimed for him by his friends he would have used the occasion as it was plain the liberal world desired; he would have

halted the war. In 1914 anything was possible; the lines were not tightly drawn, the battle had not reached the atrocity stage, neither side had learned to hate as they afterwards learned. If the President had summoned all the contending parties to a council room the war would have ended the year it began—might even have been entirely prevented. But the President failed; that is all there is to it. The second opportunity came at Versailles when the victors forgot the democratic war aims they had ranted so much about. Here again the President had his priceless chance. If he had openly opposed the imperialists then and there he would have had the support of the peoples of all countries, and he would have won the greatest moral victory of this generation. Again he failed; nothing can alter the fact of his failure. Any personal effort at explanation of these tragic events would but create further dissension between the President and the people whose leader he once was and whose cause, in the beginning and at the end of the war, he so miserably, so pitifully betrayed. If the President wishes to be kind to his own historical position, he will remain silent; he will permit us to forget him—if that is possible.

J. W. F.

The Education of Men

To educate is to draw out. It is to give the opportunity of discovering the powers and capacities of a human soul. To train is to compel a habit. Education is for men; training is for animals. A man can be trained but what he needs—and has a right to—is that development of self which we call education. He can be taught a trade. He can be shown all the movements necessary to make a shoe. But that does not make him more of a man.

If he is to be a true man and an artisan, that is an artist, he must develop within himself a certain insight, a knowledge of not only his trade but of himself and the relation of his work to the life of others. This is an evidence of his mastery of not only his trade but also himself.

The knowledge of the laws of beauty will never in themselves make a man appreciative of the glories of the setting sun. No amount of mere training will make a man a lover of the beautiful. The fixing in the memory of the ten commandments will not make a man a lover of the good.

Morality is achieved and not imposed. The new penology recognizes that mere obedience to rules, no matter how perfect, is not an evidence in itself of the development of character. For this there must be an inward change which is initiated by the will of the individual.

Education in a democracy, which after all is no more than offering an opportunity, is for the development of strong, self reliant men and women. It seeks to produce persons, not puppets. It is an expression of our need of men and women who think for themselves and who own no man as master.

The glory of the Pioneer laid in the fact that nurtured in the hard, stern school of experience he developed a capacity for self-control and self-direction. He had the inner capacity to meet any emergency. Pioneer-days are past but the need of sturdy men and brave women remains imperative if democracy itself is to endure.

Military training is not education. Its essence is the imposition of one will upon many. It inculcates habits of blind obedience. It robs men of their initiative. It reduces the person to an automaton. It is the deadly foe of democracy.

We need strong men today. There is no superabundance of men with initiative who can be trusted in places of power and responsibility. There may be a lack of men who have merely training. This may cause us inconvenience but not disaster. But when a strong self-reliant yeomanry disappears then the nation is in dire straits. He who reduces the number of the bulwarks of civilization strikes a blow at the very heart of his country.

Five million dollars spent in military training will never produce more men of the type so badly needed but, on the contrary, fewer. But five million dollars spent in providing the youth of our land with opportunities for the development of their inherent powers; with the kind of education that introduces them to the vast treasure house of the accumulated experience of the past and places on them responsibilities for individual action will give us more of the kind of men and women which we need. And in the end will make America stronger and richer and more powerful for the service of mankind.

Arthur L. Weatherly.

Cleanings

I have just reread some reports from Uncle Sam about the preparations completed for cleaning up the world so Miss Democracy need not soil even the frills on her petticoats. Take for instance Lewisite, "an oily liquid of amber color and the odor of geranium blossoms." Let loose in the open air it diffuses into a gas which kills instantly on the inhalation of the smallest amount that can by any means be measured. "When the armistice was signed we had on hand one hundred and fifty tons of this stuff, enough to poison half the population of the country if the containers were opened at strategic points."

Harper's Monthly has an article expatiating on the beauties of this and other inventions, in which the statement is made that "half a dozen three hundred pound bombs exploded to windward of the city of Berlin would have killed the entire population of the German capital. This was to be done by another invention, the automatic airplane, quite without any risk to the forces of democracy as the plane can carry for a hundred miles and land within a half mile of its target.

What a colossal clean up that would be. We would not only dispose of all the enemy's fighting men, but also of all the sick and aged, the women and children, whose support has worried humanitarians among the victors. All such problems would be wiped clean off the slate.

Then supposing that we decided to assist our neighbors to the north in a spring house cleaning. We need only run a few train loads of Lewisite discreetly distant from the Canadian border when the warm south wind was blowing, start the airplanes going and we have only to walk in and possess the land.

Or just imagine that Mexico should show a little more evidence of self respect; a few truck loads of Lewisite hurried across a neighboring state could be started her way on the wings of a norther and the only army we would need in its wake would be one of

grave diggers. And I suppose we would claim that the Lord had given us the land, as he did his chosen people of old time.

"Great and goodly cities which thou buildedst not, and houses full of good things which thou filledst not and wells digged which thou diggedst not" (oil wells in this case) "vineyards and olive trees which thou plantedst not."

This quotation from Moses' promissory speech to the Jewish proletariat whom he had told to rob the Egyptians before leaving them, sounds like those attributed to Bolshevik commissars.

Well, anyway, with the government holding a Lewisite bomb up its sleeve, our boys need not be bothered with military training. We will need no other than chemical cussedness in case of conflict with the conscript corps of civilization.

KAY V. KLEANER.

Giolitti's Bill to Abolish Secret Diplomacy

I am informed authoritatively from Italy that Signor Giolitti will formally move his bill for the democratic control of Foreign Policy, in the course of the present session of the Italian Chamber.

The bill consists of a single clause, and reads as follows:

Treaties and international understandings, whatever their subject and their character, are only valid after they have been approved by Parliament. The Government of the King can only declare war with the approval of the two Chambers.

Brief and to the point. The second proviso is important, but not capital. The first is capital. The bill if passed, will go far to abolish secret diplomacy in the Italian State; since it affects not only treaties, *but any kind of international understanding.* Critics may urge that the bill does not lay down categorically that ministers *must* communicate to Parliament any treaty or understanding negotiated with a foreign power; and, therefore, that a loophole is left for ministers to negotiate such instruments, and then to conceal them from Parliament. But any Italian ministry which acted in that way after the bill had become law, would be committing a flagrant breach of the constitution. *It would in effect be guilty of treason against the Italian State.* No ministry and no individual Italian minister is likely to incur the consequences which such a proceeding would involve. The collective and the personal risks would be too unpleasant to be lightly assumed! It really would be a matter of lamp-posts!

No; it may be confidently asserted that if this bill becomes law, secret diplomacy in Italy will have received its death blow. And that means such a tremendous limitation in the existing power of the executive to mould the national destinies, such a curtailment in the capacity for mischief of financial and militarist intrigue, such a purification of that under-world of diplomacy in which the fate of entire peoples is decided in the dark, that I can well believe Italian reaction is mustering its legions to the defence of its inner citadel. But Signor Giolitti will be assuredly supported in his courageous initiative by both Left and Right-Wing Socialists, and, of course, by his own supporters, which should give him an easy majority.

It may help us to realize the significance of the issue, and its international as well as its purely Italian importance, by examining, in the light of this bill, our own case, both present and past. The British people —"a free people," as we are described and believe ourselves to be—finds itself today in this position. Its government can both negotiate, and ratify, a treaty with a foreign power without informing Parliament until everything has been "signed, sealed and delivered." Parliamentary consent thus becomes purely academic. There is no more point in officially informing Parliament and allowing it to discuss a thing accomplished, than there would be in officially informing the Poplar Board of Guardians. Moreover, when the government does graciously communicate the treaty to Parliament, *it can withhold certain parts of the text altogether;* so that Parliament, when it perfunctorily expresses approval of the treaty, is approving an instrument whose real character may be entirely different to its apparent character. The secret articles in the Morocco Agreement with France in 1904 *were only revealed in 1911.* In taking cognizance of that Agreement, and its twin brother, the Egyptian Agreement, Parliament supposed itself to be approving of a friendly and most desirable adjustment of an Anglo-French squabble. Parliament had not the faintest idea that it was blessing a secret deal providing for the absorption by France of an African State whose independence and integrity had already been recognized by an international convention—renewed two years later!—to which Britain was a signatory; a secret deal which must inevitably be followed by a conflict between France and Germany, since Germany could no more be expected to acquiesce in Morocco falling into the lap of France as the result of a compact between ourselves and France, than we could have acquiesced in Persia falling into the lap of Germany, or Russia, as the result of a compact between those two powers.[1]

We are in exactly the same position today. When the government renews the treaty with Japan next year, *Parliament will have no means whatever of knowing whether the published text is the full text, or whether unrevealed clauses exist.* Yet upon the exact nature of the treaty the future of our relations with the United States largely depends.

Again, the "free people" of Britain finds itself in this position. Its government, or even individual members of its government, can, without even taking their other colleagues into their confidence, let alone Parliament, carry on a series of diplomatic, military and naval confabulations, involving important strategic measures and financial expenditure, with a foreign power, or powers, *which will commit Britain to participation in war under certain contingencies as effectively as a formal treaty or convention would do;* but with this advantage for ministers, and with this disadvantage to the nation, that either a clumsily-worded or careful pre-arranged question in Parliament will allow ministers to rise in their seats and deny the existence of both treaty or convention.

For example, the governments of France and Belgium have signed a military agreement, the text of which, incidentally be it said, they decline to communicate to the "League of Nations," thus violating one of its most essential provisions. The effect of this convention must necessarily be to limit, and to limit seriously, the political independence of Belgium, whose armed forces thus become at the disposal of French

[1] Moroccan affairs had been recognized as of international concern as far back as the Madrid Convention of 1880: Germany had a Treaty with the Sultan, a diplomatic representation at his court, and important, and expanding, economic interests in the country.

diplomatic and military policy.[2] Now the British people, which was told that it went to war in 1914 to preserve the independence of Belgium, has no means of ascertaining what is the attitude of its government towards this Franco-Belgian military alliance. Its government—which has raised no public objection to the French and Belgian governments openly infringing the rules of the League of which they continue, nevertheless, to form part—may have concluded a secret understanding with France, pledging the British people to support this Franco-Belgian military convention whose provisions are hidden from the League, but may well be known at the British War Office. This would mean, in effect, that the government had committed the British people to a potential war arising out of that convention. Or the government may have made a secret arrangement with Holland pledging the people of this country in advance to assist Holland in resisting by force of arms any determined pressure upon Holland by Belgium, supported by France, with the object of compelling Holland to give way to the Belgian demands in regard to the navigation of the Scheldt, and to the incorporation of Lemburg and Zeeland Flanders in the Belgian State.[3]

In that case, too, the British people would be committed to potential war in complete ignorance. I do not suggest that the British government has done either of these things. I simply point out *that it has the power to do so;* and that before the war, and during the war, it exercised that power which it then possessed, and continues to possess, in a fashion similar to that which it may do, or may have done, with regard to the hypothetical cases above mentioned.

Is there any intelligent British citizen who does not realize that a system of this kind places the country at the complete mercy of the government?

Consider what this system has done for us in the immediate past. Consider what our position would have been if the British people had been protected, as Giolitti proposes to protect the Italian people, from the autocracy wielded in matters of foreign policy by the executive during the fatal ten years 1905-1914. If our British constitution had contained a safeguard against autocratic control over foreign policy such as is provided in this Bill of the Italian statesman, Sir Edward Grey, Mr. Asquith and Lord Haldane, who involved the country without its knowledge, "behind the backs of nearly all their colleagues,"[4] and "without Parliament being in any way made aware that a policy of active intervention between France and Germany was being contemplated"[5] towards France and towards Czarist Russia before the war, could not have done so *without rendering themselves liable to impeachment for treason against the State.* The secret diplomatic, military and naval "conversations" with France, or, to put it bluntly, the making of secret plans with one power for war against another, involving dispositions for concerted action elaborated in the minutest details, which began in January, 1906, and continued until the Great War broke out,[6] and the secret naval understanding with Czarist Russia, which was finally consummated in April, 1914, at the Grey-Doumergue Conference held in Paris in April, 1914,[7] *would have been equally impossible.* The British people could not have been involved without their consent in the appalling adventure of becoming tied to France, and thereby to Czarist Russia to which France herself was tied by a military convention *postulating that a Russian general mobilization, in the view of the Czar and of the Russian and French general staffs meant war*[8]*;* in the appalling adventure which "left the peace of Great Britain at the mercy of the Russian Court,"[9] and plunged the British people into war in a Russian quarrel because they were "tied to France in the dark."[10]

In other words, if a constitutional check such as is provided in this Italian bill had existed in our country *there would have been no Great War.* President Wilson himself proclaimed to the world in March, 1919, the certain knowledge possessed by the Allied and Associated powers, that Germany would not have declared war upon Czarist Russia, and upon its partner, France, *if Germany's rulers had known positively that Britain would take sides with them.* What is no less certain is that Czarist Russia would not have issued a general mobilization order—which by the terms of the Franco-Russian Military Convention was *a decision to make war*[11]—if, as Reuter's correspondent at Petrograd put it, the Russian military authorities had not been "confident of England's support";[12] or, as the Belgian minister at Petrograd put it, if they had not acquired the "conviction" and secured the "promise" that England would come in—which the Belgian minister, reporting to his government, went on to say, "has contributed not a little to strengthen the war party."[13] And in that event the occasion for the German *ultimatum* and ensuing declaration of war would, naturally, not have arisen. That, politically and diplomatically, the ultimatum was a mad act is indisputable. But, strategically, would any country have acted otherwise? Would Britain have allowed a power to mobilize one thousand submarines in harbors facing the British coast, especially if the British government were aware that, by arrangement with another power allied to the first, the mobilization of those submarines meant that the Allied power had decided on war? What the submarines meant to us, the Russian military masses meant to Germany.

Equally certain is it that the whole train of circumstances which led to the British people finding themselves in July, 1914, "at the mercy of the Russian Court," would never have taken place—if the British people had been protected, as this Italian bill proposes to protect the Italian people, from the secret actions of their ministers. The long matured Rus-

[2] Since writing the above I have received the following from a Belgian correspondent: "Fifty young Belgian officers are sent to the Military Academy of St. Cyr (France) every year for three to six months. Many of the certificates given to these officers when they have finished their term bear this inscription: 'The recipient is entirely sympathetic to French ideas' (Le nommé est entièrement acquis aux idées de la France)." The article by M. Paul Colin in our issue of November may also be referred to with advantage in this connection.

[3] Belgium is keeping up an army of 100,000 men—an army as large as Germany's, although the population of Belgium is not larger than that of London! It is well supplied with heavy artillery. Holland's military strength is greatly inferior.

[4] Earl Loreburn in "How the War Came" (Methuen).

[5] Earl Loreburn: *op. cit.*

[6] "Continued uninterruptedly till the outbreak of war in 1914," as Colonel Repington says. The first chapter in his book, "The First World-War," is an amazing confirmation of everything the present writer has advanced since 1914.

[7] Secret archives of the Czar's Foreign Office issued by the Soviet Government.

[8] See text of Franco-Russian Military Convention.

[9] Earl Loreburn: *op. cit.*

[10] Earl Loreburn: *op. cit.*

[11] See text of Franco-Russian Military Convention.

[12] July 29, 1914.

[13] July 30, 1914

sian plot in the Balkans to force a war with Austria and to secure Constantinople—a plot exposed with a wealth of documentary evidence by the Soviet government, by the Serbian diplomatist, Bogitchevitch, and, once more, and with additional details based on her own personal investigations, by Miss M. E. Durham —was dependent for its success upon French co-operation, and French co-operation would not have been forthcoming *but for the fact that Britain was "tied to France in the dark," a sleeping partner in "Russia's quarrel."* Whither that quarrel was to lead, the Czarist war party made no concealment: "The road to Constantinople will have to be carried through Berlin."

If British ministers had not possessed the power in the years preceding the war, and which they exercised with such fatal results, of controlling autocratically the country's foreign policy; if it had been impossible for them, without violating the constitution, to contract secret agreements embodying a whole course of secret policy which committed the British people, in profound ignorance of what was being done, to take sides with one of the two great groups of rival continental powers, the Angel of Death would not have crossed the threshold of hundreds of thousands of British homes in the years 1914-1919. An alliance with the Franco-Russian combination there might conceivably have been—*with the people's consent.* But, in that case, it would have been an open alliance known to the whole world. An alliance with definite safeguards against Britain being "at the mercy of the Russian court." It would have been an alliance which, wise or unwise, would have given to the Franco-Russian combination such an enormous increase of striking power that no rival combination would have dreamed of challenging it—as President Wilson took occasion to remind us eighteen months ago.

Can our people be roused to realize the truth: the price they have paid in the past; the frightful dangers they incur today; the absurdity of using the terms "democracy" or "democratic institutions" in relation to a mechanism of government which our people have been, and continue to be, *utterly powerless to control in matters of national and individual life and death?*

The veteran Italian statesman perceives that so far as Italy is concerned, former conditions cannot be perpetuated. But he is speaking to a wider audience when he says:

> The essentials of future foreign policy must be Democratic Control. . . . International relationships are so far-reaching that the people, who have to accept and suffer all the consequences, ought no longer to be debarred from deciding, in full liberty and with complete knowledge of the causes, through their constitutional representatives.
>
> Foreign policy should be subject to the widest and freest possible discussions in Parliament, and the people ought to feel assured that it be directed above all things to the ends of peace and constructive work. Fully instructed, the people should be the arbiters of their own fate and the artificers of their own future, and should be able to forge with unfettered will the instruments of their own progress. . . .

Will the British people be content to remain the sport of a mediæval system of government, the playthings of secret diplomacy—when the people of Italy may tomorrow have escaped that most diabolical of all political instruments, and have become "artificers of their own destinies"? Will they be content that the Italians should be treated by their government as responsible citizens, whilst their own government treats them as sheep?

There is nothing to prevent the Parliamentary Labor Party bringing forward in Parliament, any day it chooses, an official resolution to the same effect as Giolitti's bill and pressing it to a division.

It would no doubt be defeated. But labor's action would be the indication of a purpose thenceforth to be unflaggingly pursued. It would rouse the country to the urgency of the matter as no other action could do. It would have the enthusiastic support of the labor movement throughout the country.

Moreover the defeat of the resolution would not exhaust the steps which labor could take to secure this indispensable constitutional reform. It would be but the opening round in a struggle to be maintained without pause or relaxation until crowned with success.

—*E. D. Morel,*
Author of "The Truth About the War."
Foreign Affairs.

SEA-GULL SONG

My thoughts are mighty sea-gulls,
  Shining out to sea,
As white and strong as sea-gulls,
  As avid of the sea.
They rest upon the green waves,
  Then mount up, one by one.
My thoughts are lordly sea-gulls,
  Lovely in the sun.

My body stays in bondage
  Upon the shore, I know;
But lazily float the sea-gulls
  Like great flakes of snow.
Lazily float the sea-gulls,
  Drifting in the blue,
My thoughts are bright as sea-gulls,
  Their flight as true.

They scorn the towns, the shore-line;
  Their home is in the sky;
They joy to breast the tempest,
  My thoughts, more strong than I.
Mean household tasks may hold me
  And four walls conquer me,
But my thoughts are sea-gulls
  Lifting out to sea.

The Saturday Evening Post. —*Mary Carolyn Davies.*

On the day when Christianity said to man: "Thou art twofold, thou art made up of two beings, one perishable, the other immortal, one carnal, the other ethereal, one enslaved by appetites, cravings and passions, the other borne aloft on the wings of enthusiasm and reverie—in a word, the one always stooping toward the earth, its mother, the other always darting up toward heaven, its fatherland"—on that day the drama was created.

VICTOR HUGO.

If by the mere force of numbers a majority should deprive a minority of any constitutional right, it might in a moral point of view justify revolution,—certainly would if such right were a vital one.

The probability that we may fail in the struggle ought not to deter us from the support of a cause which we deem to be just.

—*Abraham Lincoln.*

A Book a Week

Mary Badollet Powell Memorial

THE BOOK OF THE LONG TRAIL. By Henry Newbolt. New York: Longmans, Green and Company.

The Long Trail calls to every one. The passion for discovery is present in the heart of the youngest child, and no man may be justly called old who still desires to find something new. To explore the strange places of the earth, to travel untravelled roads, brave souls in all ages have gone confidently forth; and one after another the hidden treasures of great continents have been opened to the eyes of all mankind. Nor has the search for new territories been limited to the earth alone; scientists have scanned the heavens, looked out on other worlds, counted the stars and measured the firmament. In a field not less vital if less majestic in size men have explored the tiniest particles, the merest atoms of matter and studied the manner and purpose of the most obscure movement. Out of all this research and exploration there emerges in our time an understanding of Nature that surpasses all that other ages have ever known. Life is beginning to be more easily understood. Creation is no longer a closed book. Man is reading the ancient riddle. Truth is coming into her own.

This book is an introduction to the history of British exploration and discovery in the past hundred years. The men who succeeded the Elizabethan adventurers, Raleigh, Drake and their kin, are here presented; and we see how well they have "carried on." The tradition of "seek and find" found worthy champions in the Nineteenth Century, and our own generation has not failed. Even as we write news comes of the setting forth of a new expedition to scale Mt. Everest and of a new exploration at the source of the Nile. There are questions still to be answered, and the searchers never rest.

The first section of the book is devoted to the story of John Franklin's expedition in northern Canada (1819-1822). The adventures of this campaign read like a modern romance, and the experiences of Franklin and his men might well furnish the theme for a great sermon on the modern search for the Grail. If men ever approach God, it must be at times when all but faith is lost, when every danger threatens.

From Franklin we pass on to the adventures of Richard Burton and go with him to the tomb of Mohammed at Al-Madinah and to the holy city of Mecca (1853),—a colorful and dangerous journey. Burton's career is undoubtedly one of the most adventurous of all; we gasp in admiration and surprise at his daring. His preparation for his expeditions was magnificent; he learned the *life*—not merely the language—of the people he intended visiting, then went among them as a native; and so skillful was he that he deceived his own guides and his best friends, as well as uncounted strangers.

Then follows the story of David Livingstone and the closely allied story of Henry Stanley. To these two brave spirits our debt will always be great; they opened to the White world the heart of the Black world, and gave us an ideal of service that to this day has few equals. Before Livingstone penetrated the African forest the Dark Continent was little more than the slave-source of Europe. Against the slave trade he struck a staggering blow. "Black men have souls!" he cried; and what should have been self-evident to all men became clear at last to at least a few. To Stanley we owe, for one thing, the knowledge we have of Livingstone's last years; and this is very precious. Had the missionary died before Stanley found him, had his priceless journals been lost, a great part of Livingstone's work would have been unknown to the outer world. To Stanley also we owe a vast store of independent information gathered on many journeys and expeditions. If there is a more thrilling page in the history of modern times than that written by these two men (1840-1904) we do not know of it.

The story of Robert O'Hara Burke and his assistant W. J. Wills and their ill-fated Australian exploration (1860-1861) is then given, and a very fascinating and pathetic story it is. They were plain soldiers, not picturesque, but they struggled bravely and died "without fear and without reproach." It is interesting to note that the frightened, wandering natives of Australia and the stalwart warriors of the Congo forest alike shed tears when the white explorers perished; the gentle heart of both tribes was touched in the same way by the suffering of the strangers, though the scenes of the drama were so distant and different.

From Burke and Wills we go on to meet Francis Younghusband and march with him across China and through forbidden Tibet to the very throne room of the Dalai Lama at mysterious Lassa (1886-1903). In Younghusband we have a combination of soldier and poet, and the result is brave deeds and beautiful records. How little all these journeys would have meant if no journals had been kept!

It is a long road from the hills of northern India to the icy plains of the Antarctic, but it is from the adventures of Younghusband to those of Robert Scott that we turn. The story of Scott is certainly one of the most dramatic in modern history. He was a born explorer, he gave his life that a new chapter might be added to mankind's book of knowledge. His struggle to reach the South Pole (1910-1912), his arrival at the Pole and discovery of evidence of the previous visit of the Norwegians, and finally his vain effort to return to his base of operation,—all make a human drama as poignant as the Greek.

The book closes with a long chapter on Alexander Woolaston's expedition in "the Mountains of the Moon," Africa, and in New Guinea (1905-1910). Woolaston's contribution to the treasury of science is especially important for he has the scientific attitude toward facts which earlier explorers often lacked.

What Henry Newbolt has done is a good and useful work. He has studied the lives and records of his heroes, summarized and edited them, emphasizing typical adventures and discoveries, showing a man's character by one or two well-chosen instances of his conduct, representing their purposes faithfully, giving us in one volume the best of the contents of fifty larger volumes. If one cares to add to one's acquaintance with modern history some useful information respecting the Long Trail and those brave men who have followed it, we know of no worthier book than this.

JAMES WALDO FAWCETT.

THE FIELD

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

TAG DAY IN CHINESE CITIES FOR FAMINE VICTIMS

In helping China over the terrible crisis presented by the famine in the northern provinces, Americans will be helping those who help themselves. Not only has the Chinese Government taken active measures for relief of the sufferers, but the large cities are busily engaged in raising funds from private individuals. What is more they have taken a lesson from American experience in these matters and have adopted methods as up to date as any that may be found in New York, Chicago or any city of the United States.

Chinese papers just received at headquarters of the American Committee for China Famine Fund tell of "Tag Day" in Peking. In all, men and women students from thirty-five colleges participated. The various sections of the city were carefully marked out and allotted to various colleges; the students exhibited the utmost keenness in patrolling the streets, and one gathers that few passersby escaped being "tagged." In addition, the billboard artists were conspicuous, placarding the city with posters descriptive of the tragic facts of the famine area. By consent of the Board of War airships flew over the old city, across whose walls no stranger in the old days might so much as peer, and airplanes scattered appeals for the famine sufferers.

Similar scenes, the American Committee is informed, have been enacted in other cities. In Shanghai, it is reported, as evidence of the immense strides which the emancipation of women has taken in China, largely the result of education in our missionary schools and colleges, that daughters of the most exclusive and fashionable families in Chinese society took an active and enthusiastic part in "tag day." A far cry this, from the old days when Chinese girls of good family had their feet tightly bound in childhood, and were condemned in consequence to hobble painfully for the rest of their lives. No woman with feet so constricted could have stood the rigors of collecting in the streets on a "tag day"! That is one of the many blessings for which Chinese womanhood today is thanking the teaching of our Christian missionaries. Today those missionaries are laboring heroically to feed not only the souls but also the poor wasted bodies of the 45,000,000 people in North China who are in imminent peril of starving to death. And they are relying, as in the past, on the practical sympathy of the Christian churches of America to provide the funds which are so urgently needed. Funds may be contributed either to local churches, to Foreign Mission societies, or to the Treasurer of the American Committee for China Famine Fund, Vernon Munroe,

The Bible House, New York City.

J. J. Underwood, of the *Seattle Times*, just returned from China, suggests ways in which America may not only save the lives of millions, but can also prevent a recurrence of these famines in this district. He suggests either sinking wells or a system of irrigation, plans for which have been worked out by American engineers and are entirely feasible, and so providing all Chinese who are still able with work. In this way relief funds can be made to accomplish the maximum result and will prevent the recurrence of similar disasters that date back 2,500 years, and ultimately will return manifold every dollar that is contributed to the cause.

"My hat is off to the Japanese," he says, "for what they did in Korea. When drought overtook Korea the Japanese got busy. They stopped the collection of rents, appropriated 40,000,000 yen, built roads everywhere, and put in a reclamation project. They put every Korean to work. They saved every Korean—ordinarily the loss would have been a million."

Friends' Intelligencer. —*E. K. B.*

CHURCH UNITY IN INDIA

While the western lands are talking about it, the Orient may lead the world in establishing Church unity. Several years ago, we are informed, the missionaries and Indian Christians of South India organized the South India United Church, composed of Congregationalists, Presbyterians and Dutch Reformed. The intention was not to associate together in a Western or American Church, but rather an Indian Church, the character and type of which should be determined by the Indian Christians themselves. Now, says the Rev. Harold Cooper, of Madura, India, in *The Christian Herald*, "that Church is well established and thoroughly organized throughout the whole of South India. The relation of the missionary is peculiar. He is very largely controlled by the Indian Church, and the foreign missionary societies themselves are happy to have it so." This union has become so successful that the Christian leaders of India put to themselves the question:

"'Why not have one great united Church of India?'" Such a proposal almost took away one's breath; but the proposers were men of vision and prayer, and, within the past eighteen months, it has seemed as though this dream might come true.

"What has happened? The answer is one of progress. Negotiations between Episcopalians, Methodists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and others are in progress, which promise the realization of this dream of union. The South India United Church has appointed a committee with a view to union with the Anglicans on the basis of a constitutional episcopacy, and equality of ministry, and open communion with all evangelical Christians."

Meanwhile the Christians of North India are planning to enter into organic union, so that we may see in the near future an Indian Church composed of about three million members.

THE WORLD'S "COLD SHOULDER" TO JAPAN.

Whether their interests are affected or not, only too many countries think ill of Japan and "try to slander and alienate her from other countries," with the result that Japan is "certainly isolated spiritually," despite the Anglo-Japanese alliance and the fact that she is "one of the Allies." This is the lament of the Tokyo *Nichi-nichi*, which explains that while there may be divers reasons for this state of affairs, the "most important reason is the militarism and bureaucracy of Japan," and it adds:

"British and American publicists regard Japan as a second Germany, and they believe that her domestic and foreign policy is all shaped by the hands of the militarists. As a matter of fact, such an opinion is held by Mr. Lamont, who is said to be comparatively well informed regarding the conditions in this country and the temperament of the people. Perhaps it is not unnatural that the average Europeans and Americans who learn things Japanese only through foreign journals should think that Japan is wholly militaristic. But militarism is now a thing of the past; the militarists themselves are aware that their principles are not in accord with the trend of affairs in the world. If Europeans and Americans learn that the Japanese Government is no longer under the influence of the militarists and bureaucrats and that no unreasonable ambitions whatever underlie Japan's military operations, they ought to co-operate with us in solving the great problems of the world. At the same time it is necessary that the Japanese should be open-minded so that they may not forfeit the sympathy of the world."

The Literary Digest.

LIKE THEE.

Such is my life,
O Stone,
Like thee; like thee,
Little stone,
Like thee,
Light stone;
Like thee,
A pebble rolling
On the roadway,
On the pathway;
Like thee,
Humble stone of the highway;
Like thee,
Who on stormy days
Liest deep,
In the mire,
And at times
Flashest into sparks
Under the hoofs
And under the wheels;
Like thee, who wast not made
To be a stone
Of a warehouse,
Of a law-court,
Of a palace,
Nor of a church;
Like thee,
A wandering stone;
Like thee,
Who perchance wast made
For a sling only,
A small stone
And
Light.

London Spectator. —*León Felipe.*

Schumann & Company

Cleaners of

FANCY GOWNS AND KID GLOVES

Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth

PHONE DREXEL 231
ALL DEPARTMENTS

MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3954 Cottage Grove Avenue

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

WRIGHT & COMPANY
STEAM—DOMESTIC
COAL
TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office:
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.
PRINTERS and BINDERS
Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS
728 E. 39th Street
Phone Douglas 244

Bowman Dairy Company
MILK BOTTLED IN THE COUNTRY
Milk Cream Butter Buttermilk
DO OUR WAGONS SERVE YOU?
WHY NOT HAVE THE BEST?
4221-4229 State Street Telephones at all Division Offices
EVANSTON CHICAGO OAK PARK

Subscribe for and read UNITY—
Do not miss a single number!

UNITY is a weekly paper which for forty-two years, under the editorship of Jenkin Lloyd Jones, upheld the fundamental principles of religion, political economy, and social relations; and this policy is maintained under the new editors, John Haynes Holmes and Francis Neilson. During the War UNITY was steadfast to the cause of righteousness and good will among the peoples of the earth. It has constantly dealt with the grave economic and political problems of Europe and the rest of the world in a straightforward unflinching manner, and it has from time to time published information of deep interest to its readers with which no other paper in the United States has dealt. It is non-sectarian. It advocates free religion and equal opportunity, as the means of uniting all peoples in the bonds of fellowship and amity. UNITY seeks to direct the minds of its readers to all that is best in the world of thought as expressed in the literature of the day, and its literary reviews are not the least valuable part of the several departments which its staff conducts from week to week. There are men and women of international renown writing for its columns and its subscribers are to be found in all the important countries of the world.

If these principles appeal to you, will you not subscribe and interest your friends?

- - - -